

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.235
27 January 1966
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 27 January 1966, at 3.00 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. S. K. TSARAPKIN

(USSR)

OF MICHAEL
MAY 10 1966
DOCUMENT
COLLECTED

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A. CORREA do LAGO
Mr. D. SILVEIRA da MOTA
Mr. C. H. PAULINO PRATES

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LUKANOV
Mr. Y. GOLEMANOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV
Mr. D. POPOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

Canada:

Mr. E. L. M. BURNS
Mr. S. F. RAE
Mr. C. J. MARSHALL
Mr. P. D. LEE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. Z. CERNIK
Mr. P. PAVLIK
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:

Mr. A. ZELLEKE

India:

Mr. V. C. TRIVEDI
Mr. K. P. JAIN
Mr. B. AHMED
Mr. S. V. PURUSHOTTAM

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. G. P. TOZZOLI
Mr. S. AVETTA
Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:

Mr. A. GOMEZ ROBLEDO
Mr. M. TELLO MACIAS

Nigeria:

Mr. L. C. N. OBI

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Poland:

Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN
Mr. K. SZABLEVSKI

Romania:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCO
Mr. N. ECOBESCO
Mr. C. UNGUREANU
Mr. A. COROIANU

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL
Mr. P. HAMMARSKJOLD
Mr. R. BOMAN
Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. S. K. TSARAPKIN
Mr. O. A. GRINEVSKY
Mr. V. V. SHUSTOV
Mr. G. K. EFIMOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF
Mr. A. OSMAN
Mr. M. KASSEM
Mr. M. SHAKER

United Kingdom:

Lord CHALFONT
Sir H. BEELEY
Mr. J. G. TAHOURDIN
Miss E. J. M. RICHARDSON

United States of America:

Mr. W. C. FOSTER
Mr. C. H. TIMBERLAKE
Mr. D. S. MACDONALD
Mr. G. BUNN

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. P. P. SPINELLI

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I declare open the two hundred and thirty-fifth plenary meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Speaking as Chairman of this meeting, and on behalf of the co-Chairmen and, I believe, of all members of the Committee, as well as in my capacity as representative of the Soviet Union, I venture to express to the delegation of India and to its Government our profound condolence upon the untimely death of the distinguished statesman and political leader of India, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri. Mr. Shastri was well known throughout the world as an active fighter for the relaxation of international tension, for disarmament and for the strengthening of peace and international co-operation. Shortly before his death he said that the nations wanted, not conflicts and wars, but peace and progress; that they needed, not weapons and military supplies, but food, clothing and a roof over their heads.

The name of Mr. Shastri, who was distinguished for his realistic way of thinking, is linked with the emergence of the historic Tashkent Declaration, to the drafting of which he made a great personal contribution. That declaration, which is in conformity with the basic interests of the peoples of India and Pakistan, establishes peace in Hindustan, lays down ways leading towards the settlement of a number of important issues, and contributes to a general improvement of the international situation. Therefore this loss suffered by the people of India is a close and understandable loss for all of us, and we deeply sympathize with the people of India in this loss.

Permit me to express condolence also to the delegation of Nigeria on the death of Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, the former Prime Minister of Nigeria, a country which is endeavouring to make its contribution in the Eighteen-Nation Committee to the solution of the problem of disarmament and the lessening of international tension.

The recent appalling air disaster caused the untimely death of a remarkable Indian nuclear scientist, Mr. Homi Bhabha, who was one of the outstanding research-workers in the field of nuclear physics and a tireless advocate of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. In recognition of his achievements in this field he was unanimously elected Chairman of the first International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held in Geneva in 1955, in which I also participated as a member of the Soviet delegation. Permit me to express

(The Chairman, USSR)

to the delegation of India our sincere condolences upon the death of this scientist of world-wide renown.

I propose that we honour the memories of those who have died by a minute of silence.

The representatives stood in silence for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I call on Mr. Spinelli, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Mr. SPINELLI (Special Representative of the Secretary-General): On behalf of the Secretary-General and, if I may, personally, I should like to add a few words to what has just been said.

It was only a few months ago that we welcomed Mr. Shastri to Geneva, here in the Palais des Nations, in this very Council Chamber. His combination of gentleness and immense application to work was perhaps what gave him that quality of statesmanship so well suited to the age of the United Nations. He was deeply interested in our work both for peace and for well-being, and he always devoted himself, in the words of our Charter, to the dignity and worth of the human person.

Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa was another man of great practical abilities who brought to politics a quietness that retained something of the simplicity of a teacher even in the midst of public life. Here too the United Nations, so deeply concerned with Africa, suffered a loss.

The death of Mr. Bhabha is especially poignant to us here in Geneva for, as President of the 1955 Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, he won not only our admiration but also our affection. Mr. Bhabha bridged many cultures. It was this perhaps as much as his great scientific learning that made his contribution to the work of our Organization so invaluable. He was travelling to the United Nations when he was killed.

In extending on behalf of the Secretary-General the sympathy of the Secretariat of the United Nations to the peoples of India and of Nigeria, we can truly say that the death of each of these three men is a loss felt by the whole family of the United Nations.

Mr. TRIVEDI (India): My delegation is immensely touched and deeply grateful to your, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this Committee, and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and his Special Representative, Mr. Spinelli, for the sympathy shown to us and to the Government of India on the grievous loss that we have suffered by the passing of Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri. The Government and the people of India are greatly heartened by the sympathy, support, understanding and good will shown to them by the great nations represented on the Committee and by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

As our Chairman has said, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri served as Prime Minister of India at a very difficult time in our history and died working for the cause of international peace and friendship. Mr. Shastri was, above all, a man of peace. On him had fallen the mantle of his great and illustrious predecessor, that valiant and indefatigable fighter for peace and disarmament, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. In his very first statement after becoming Prime Minister of India on 9 June 1964, Mr. Shastri reaffirmed his Government's continued support of the United Nations and his determination to work in co-operation with other peaceful nations of the world for the cause of bringing peace and freedom to humanity. He stressed in particular the most vital problem of disarmament facing mankind today. He said:

"For countless generations mankind has been yearning for peace. The supreme task facing the United Nations is to ensure not only that war is banished but that war is made impossible."

Mr. Shastri was not only a proponent, but also a practitioner of peace. He died in Tashkent at the very moment of his triumph, a triumph of the spirit of peace and friendship and of the ideal that force must never be used for the settlement of differences between nations. In his life, as well as in his death, this gentle leader of the 500 million people of our land typified the philosophy of peace that we have held sacred and inviolable throughout our long history.

The Government of India is pledged to carry on the same policy of peace. Immediately upon her election our new Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, reaffirmed her abiding faith in the national and international policies of her great father, and her determination to continue along the path of her predecessors. Addressing a press conference she said that her message to the country was to encourage the Tashkent spirit and to create a climate of peace both at home and abroad.

(Mr. Trivedi, India)

The Indian delegation is also grateful for the references which have been made to the tragic loss which India suffered only three days ago by the death of Mr. Homi Bhabha. All members of the Committee were personally acquainted with him, and we are comforted by finding that all of us around this table and eminent men all over the world share our nation's grief at his tragic demise. He was not only a great scientist, but also a great worker for disarmament. His contribution to the peaceful uses of atomic energy will be remembered for all time. It was in this very city, as you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Spinelli have said, that he presided nearly eleven years ago over the first International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.

I might also take this opportunity to join the Committee in extending to our esteemed colleague, Mr. Obi, and through him to the Government and people of Nigeria, the deep sympathy of the Indian delegation as well as of the Government and people of India at the tragic loss which they have suffered.

Before concluding this brief intervention expressing our gratitude for the sympathy and good will of the Committee, I should like to quote the concluding sentence of the message given by our President to the nation yesterday, on our Republic Day:

"Let us work for just and peaceful settlements wherever possible, and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, as an essential preliminary for complete disarmament. That way lies sanity."

Mr. OBI (Nigeria): My delegation would like to express its appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Spinelli, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and to the Committee as a whole, for the tributes which have just been paid to the memory of my former Prime Minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa. Sir Abubakar was a peace-loving man who throughout his tenure of office lived up to the pledge which he gave at the rostrum of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1960 when Nigeria was admitted to the World Organization: to seek for peace in the world based on respect for the equality of nations and for the principles of the United Nations Charter, policies which the new military Government of my country has undertaken to continue.

(Mr. Obi, Nigeria)

I should also like to express to the Indian delegation our sincere condolences on the great loss which the people and Government of India have suffered by the death of the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri. Although in office for a relatively short period, his contribution to international life and in particular to the search for peace and security was, to say the least, impressive. It is worthy of note that Mr. Shastri died while he was pursuing the aims of peace and just at the conclusion of an agreement which, it is hoped, will provide a useful and firm basis for mutual understanding as well as good and friendly relations between India and her neighbour Pakistan.

My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to express its sense of shock and regret at the death of Mr. Homi Bhabha in an air crash a few days ago. Mr. Bhabha was a well-known international figure, especially at the Pugwash conferences.

The CHAIRMAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I call on Mr. Spinelli, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Mr. SPINELLI (Special Representative of the Secretary-General): On behalf of the Secretary-General, U Thant, I have the privilege of welcoming once again to the United Nations Office at Geneva the delegations to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. I also have the honour to convey to the Conference the following message from the Secretary-General:

"The resumption of the Conference so soon after the completion of the disarmament discussions in the General Assembly is a measure of the importance which the members of the Disarmament Committee attach to their work.

"During the recess in the work of the Conference the twentieth session of the General Assembly gave detailed consideration to the report of the Conference (ENDC/160), and provided an opportunity for all Members of the United Nations to review the work of the Committee and to make their own contributions to the solution of the many urgent problems in the field of disarmament."

(Mr. Spinelli)

"The General Assembly adopted a number of important resolutions on various disarmament questions -- on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, on general and complete disarmament, on a comprehensive test ban, on the denuclearization of Africa and on a world disarmament conference, among other questions. These resolutions were adopted by overwhelming majorities -- as all representatives here know -- with only a single negative vote recorded against only one resolution.

"The letter of the Secretary-General transmitting to you the texts of three resolutions and the decision of the General Assembly on the question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons is before you (ENDC/161). These resolutions entrust the Eighteen-Nation Committee with specific responsibilities and request the Committee to submit reports to the General Assembly.

"The texts of the other two resolutions (ENDC/162) have also been transmitted by the Secretary-General for your information. You also have before you the text of a letter addressed to me by His Holiness Pope Paul VI containing an urgent appeal for disarmament on the occasion of the resumption of the work of the Conference (ENDC/163).

"While I do not wish to comment on the substantive issues which it is your task to resolve, I do wish to draw your attention to the fact that the Members of the United Nations made it amply clear at the last session that they regarded the early achievement of a treaty to prevent the direct or indirect proliferation of nuclear weapons as the most imperative and urgent object of your negotiations. This simple objective, of course, encompasses a complex set of problems and of possible measures to deal with them. I am confident that all delegations here will exert a major effort to find a solution to these problems and to achieve agreement on a non-proliferation treaty. I am also confident that, while your negotiations are proceeding, both the nuclear and the non-nuclear States represented here will continue to exercise the restraint and responsibility that they have demonstrated in recent years.

(Mr. Spinelli)

"In addition to the problem of non-proliferation, the General Assembly also requested the Eighteen-Nation Committee to give its urgent consideration to achieving a comprehensive test-ban treaty and to making substantial progress towards general and complete disarmament.

"Difficult though present circumstances seem to be, I am convinced that all the participants in this Conference will wish to take advantage of the renewed opportunity provided by your meetings to make an effective contribution towards international peace which the achievement of agreement on some measure of disarmament would signify. I extend to all of you my earnest good wishes for constructive negotiations and success in your endeavours."

The CHAIRMAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I think I shall be expressing the opinion of the whole Committee if, through Mr. Spinelli, I convey to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on behalf of the members of the Committee our gratitude for the kind sentiments and good wishes expressed in his message to the Committee.

That concludes the public part of the meeting. We shall now have a recess for five minutes, after which the work of the Committee will be resumed in private.

The meeting was suspended at 3.35 p.m. and resumed at 3.40 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): We are continuing the work of the Committee. Before passing on to the formal duties of the Committee and calling on the next speaker, I should like to welcome Mr. Hussein Khallaf, who is representing the United Arab Republic for the first time in the Eighteen-Nation Committee, and to wish him success in his activities in the Committee. We should also like to welcome Mr. Blusztajn on his return to the Committee as the representative of Poland. We all know him as a very active representative with whom it is always a pleasure for us to work.

The list of speakers before me names the following representatives: the Soviet Union, the United States, Nigeria, the United Arab Republic and the United Kingdom. Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to inform the Committee of the meeting of the co-Chairmen and to report the recommendations agreed between them concerning the procedure of work of the Committee.

(The Chairman, USSR)

The co-Chairmen have agreed to recommend to the members of the Committee the following procedure of work. As in the past, the Committee could at first hold two meetings a week: on Tuesday and Thursday, at the usual time, 10.30 a.m. Some of the first meetings could be allocated to the general debate, in accordance with the established practice -- unless, of course, the Committee has any other views. The co-Chairmen also recommend that at the end of the general debate -- if it takes place -- some of the following meetings should be devoted to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Then one meeting could be devoted to other measures aimed at limiting the arms race, and one meeting could be devoted to the question of general and complete disarmament, and so on in the same order as I have just stated, unless it is subsequently revised.

If there are no observations by members of the Committee, we shall regard the procedure I have just stated as adopted by the Committee. There are no observations: we consider the procedure of work adopted.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I should now like to speak in my capacity as the representative of the Soviet Union on the substance of the questions.

Over four months separate us from the last session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, which we interrupted after reporting to the United Nations General Assembly that during the past session the Committee had again failed to reach any concrete agreement either on questions of general and complete disarmament or on measures aimed at the lessening of international tension. Both in the Committee and at the General Assembly the overwhelming majority of representatives directly connected the absence of progress in the matter of disarmament with the policy of the Western Powers, especially that of the United States, which has openly taken the path of armed intervention in the internal affairs of other States and peoples fighting for their liberation, and which has openly taken the line of intensifying the arms race and military preparations. At present everyone notes with alarm that the international situation has recently reached an unprecedented state of tension and that the danger of the escalation in depth and width of the military conflict started by the United States in South-East Asia has increased very greatly. For this reason, here in the Committee, nobody can close his eyes to what is happening outside the Geneva Palais des Nations.

(The Chairman, USSR)

The discussion on disarmament has already been going on for a considerable time in an atmosphere, in which the largest Power in the Western world, the United States, has unleashed and is waging a war of aggression against the small but freedom-loving and heroic Viet-Nameese people. The people of that country want one thing: to live, to work and to make progress in accordance with the laws which they have themselves established. That is the natural and inalienable right of every people; it is recognized and embodied in the United Nations Charter.

Yet today we see, how in Viet-Nam and in other parts of the world that right is being flagrantly violated. Recently the United States has, month by month and day by day, been going ever higher up the steps of dangerous military escalation. It is intensifying its aggression against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. No longer relying on its Saigon puppets, the United States itself has directly entered the war against the peasants of South Viet-Nam.

We are also witnessing the attempts of the United States to expand the area of military operations in South-East Asia by extending military operations to Laos and Cambodia. Everyone sees that the United States, having started the war in Viet-Nam, is not now interested in disarmament. It is well-known that the United States is spending thousands of millions of dollars on the war in Viet-Nam. The United States expenditures on the war in Viet-Nam have now reached the level of about \$6,000 million a year -- that is, more than \$16.5 million a day. The number of United States armed forces in the Viet-Nam area had grown by the end of last year to 180,000 servicemen in Viet-Nam itself, to whom must be added almost 60,000 men on board United States ships close to the Viet-Nameese coast.

These figures do not satisfy the United States generals who demand more soldiers and plan to increase their army in Viet-Nam to 340,000 men. As the United States aggression expands, so the United States military expenditures increase. In May 1965 the Pentagon was allocated a further \$700 million for the war against Viet-Nam. Within three months, in August last year, when the United States brought its Navy and Air Force into the military operations in Viet-Nam, another \$1,700 million were added to that sum. According to the United States press, leaders in the United States Congress believe that the intensification of the war in Viet-Nam will increase United States military expenditures by \$10-14,000 million a year.

As the United States sees that its aggression in Viet-Nam is encountering growing resistance by the Viet-Nameese people and wrathful condemnation by the peoples

(Mr. Chairman, USSR)

of all countries, it is naturally trying to manoeuvre. While expanding its military operations, it also raises from time to time a great din about its alleged desire for peace in Viet-Nam. But it is easy to verify the sincerity of these United States assertions. If the United States leaders really desire to end the war in Viet-Nam, who is preventing them from getting out of Viet-Nam and leaving the Viet-Nameese people in peace, thus providing an opportunity to settle the question in the spirit of the provisions laid down in the programme of the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam and of the National Assembly of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam? The United States knows quite well that this programme is fully in keeping with the main military and political provisions of the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

The whole point, however, is that, while publicizing its so-called "peace initiative", the United States is in fact continuing to increase the number of its armed forces in South Viet-Nam and is appropriating additional thousands of millions of dollars to escalate and expand the war in Viet-Nam.

In speaking about the tragic and bloody events in Viet-Nam, which have been caused by the United States and form the background to the resumption of the meetings of our Committee, I should like to ask my colleagues to cast their minds back for a moment to what happened a little more than two years ago. We all remember that in August 1963, after many years of fruitless negotiations, the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water (ENDC/100/Rev.1) was concluded. Subsequently the General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/1884; ENDC/117) banning the placing of nuclear weapons in orbit, and a number of useful steps to reduce international tension were taken. At that time everyone realized that it was necessary to exert the utmost efforts and to do everything to give further development to those first measures which, though modest, were measures nevertheless aimed at limiting the arms race and lessening international tension.

Unfortunately this did not prove to be the case. The firing by the United States on ships of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam in the Gulf of Tonkin in August 1964, the participation of the United States in the military intervention in the Congo, its armed intervention in the affairs of the Dominican Republic and, lastly, the bombing by United States aircraft of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, together with United States aggression against the

(The Chairman, USSR)

Viet-Nameese people in the South, have again plunged the world into a state of extreme tension. It must be admitted that the situation in the Committee has deteriorated and there is increased danger of the Committee getting even further bogged down in fruitless discussions without advancing a step towards the accomplishment of the tasks confronting it.

The aggressive policy pursued by the United States has given a new and exceedingly powerful impetus to the arms race. The United States press is now publishing numerous articles indicating that the United States is planning to increase the strength of its armed forces by 25 per cent. As reported on 1 January 1966, the armed forces of the United States numbered 2.7 million men. This increase in the United States Army has already had and will undoubtedly have an ever-increasing effect on production for military purposes and on the growth of military expenditures. The Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stanley Resor, announced last year the plans of his Department to provide new military equipment during the next five years at a total cost of \$20,000 million. According to the United States magazine United States News and World Report, such expenditure would be a record for peacetime; it even exceeded the average rate of expenditure of the Army during the three years of the Korean War. The United States plans considerable further increases in appropriations to meet the needs of the Defense Department for the fiscal year 1966-67.

On 25 January The New York Times published a graph showing the expenditures in the United States budget for the fiscal year 1966-67. This shows that of the total sum of the budget of \$112,800 million, 62 per cent, 62 per cent will be allocated in one form or another to military expenditures. In the meantime, while the war in Viet-Nam is going on, the United States, as the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, stated at the end of last year, has decided to increase by 20 per cent the number of its nuclear warheads in Western Europe, although, according to Mr. McNamara, they already number 5,000.

Other Western Powers are also actively participating in the arms race, evidently calculating that, at a time when the whole world is watching with concern the events in South-East Asia, it is possible to carry out unobtrusively militaristic plans which at any other time would have aroused widespread opposition in all countries. The leading circles in Western Germany have been particularly active in taking advantage of the tense state of international affairs caused by

(The Chairman, USSR)

the United States aggression in Viet-Nam. The leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany, as is shown by the policy statement of Chancellor Erhard on 10 November 1965, no longer hesitate to proclaim loudly their revenge-seeking claims, and they state their intention to re-carve the map of Europe. It is for this reason that the West German leaders are giving such attention to the rearmament of the Bundeswehr and so insistently demanding that Western Germany be given access to nuclear weapons.

The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. L.I. Brezhnev, speaking on 15 January 1956 at the Mongolian-Soviet Friendship Meeting in Ulan Bator, stated:

"Unlike Asia, in Europe no wars are being waged at present. But the European continent, one can say, is mined by the revanchist claims of Bonn. Those claims have now been raised to the level of the official policy of the Federal Republic of Germany".

The whole world is a witness of the way in which the Potsdam agreements providing for the eradication of militarism on German territory have been grossly infringed in the postwar years, with the direct sanction and active encouragement of the Western Powers. Year by year the existing limitations on the armament of the German army have been discarded one by one, thus giving West Germany an increasingly free hand to produce the most modern types of weapons.

Today, when the armed intervention of the United States of America in the affairs of Viet-Nam has thrown the world back to the times of the greatest aggravation of tension, the West German leaders have seen in this a favourable moment for them to put forward further military demands with even greater insistence, declaring their claim to possess nuclear weapons, at first within the framework of NATO.

It has to be noted with regret that the Western Powers, headed by the United States, have begun to give way to the nuclear blackmail of the Federal Republic of Germany. In his statement at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on 8 December, 1965, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Mr. Gromyko, said in this respect that there are circles in the United States which are ready to retreat step by step before the importunate demands of the Federal Republic of Germany. At the end of last year there were reports that the United States military authorities were equipping individual military units of the western countries belonging to NATO, and in the first instance units of the West German Bundeswehr, with tactical atomic weapons.

West Germany is insistent in its demand that its NATO allies should not interrupt active discussion of the various plans for the creation of NATO multilateral nuclear forces in which West Germany would participate. It has recently been said that plans have now been revived for the creation of a NATO nuclear submarine fleet of United States and British submarines with mixed crews, among whom it is proposed to include West German sailors.

Attempts are being made to camouflage the access of West Germany to nuclear weapons by creating a so-called "NATO nuclear committee" with the participation of West Germany. At the same time attempts are being made to convince us that the participation of the Federal Republic of West Germany will not involve any risk at all, since that country, it is alleged, will merely have a voice in the discussion of matters of nuclear strategy (what is implied in this term is the question of the use of nuclear weapons and nothing else).

It is characteristic that all this intensive activity by NATO, the aim of which is to give West Germany access in one form or another to nuclear weapons, is taking place at the very time when the United Nations General Assembly and the Eighteen-Nation Committee are considering and trying to solve the question of how to halt the dangerous process of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Soviet delegation is of the opinion that plans to create NATO multilateral Atlantic forces or any other plans giving West Germany access to nuclear weapons are the main obstacle to a rapid solution of the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

We are to have a detailed discussion on non-proliferation, and in this connexion I should like to recall the following statements made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Mr. Gromyko, at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet on 8 December 1965:

"The Government of the USSR, realizing its responsibility for the security of the Soviet people and its obligations in the matter of preventing German aggression, deems it necessary to state that if, regardless of existing international agreements, certain NATO Powers go so far as to satisfy the nuclear claims of the Federal Republic of Germany, be it in the form of multilateral or Atlantic nuclear forces, on the basis of the creation of some sort of 'atomic committee' or in any other form, the Soviet Union will be compelled to take all measures which it, together with its allies and friends, will deem necessary to ensure peace in Europe".

(The Chairman, USSR)

In speaking of facts which cause anxiety for the fate of the world, we should like to emphasize that, in the conditions of the present aggravation of international tension, the Committee is faced with particularly crucial tasks, which have been placed on its agenda by life itself. The expansion of foreign intervention and acts of aggression are causing great indignation among the peoples of the world, who consider it their duty to oppose this dangerous development of events. There have recently been many events which show that the ideas of peace and disarmament have powerful supporters and that our struggle for these aims here in Geneva has great meaning and significance. Among these events we single out first of all the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly and the resolutions which it adopted.

In this context particular importance attaches to the Declaration adopted by the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly, upon the initiative of the Soviet Government, on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty (A/RES/2131(XX)), which is an essential condition for the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems. The implementation by States of this recommendation of the General Assembly is the condition and guarantee for ensuring peace and normalizing the international situation.

All those who are concerned with disarmament will note with satisfaction that, thanks to the active stand of the socialist countries and the majority of the non-aligned countries, the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted paramount attention to disarmament questions and adopted a number of useful resolutions on the present-day aspects of this problem. Many representatives at the session, who expressed the concern of their nations at the present unhappy state of the international situation, emphasized that, in these conditions, we should double or increase tenfold our efforts in the struggle for disarmament. Thus, for example, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ghana, Mr. Quaison-Sackey, referring to the unsatisfactory state of international affairs said:

"This catalogue of conflict, war and tension points to the need for a genuine effort toward the achievement of general and complete disarmament. If this could be done, the international atmosphere would change considerably to enable the many localized conflicts to be contained and eliminated."

(A/PV.1346, provisional, p.21)

(The Chairman, USSR)

The Assembly adopted an exceptionally important decision concerning the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The provision of the resolution on this question to the effect that "The Treaty should be void of any loop-holes which might permit nuclear or non-nuclear Powers to proliferate, directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons in any form" (A/RES/2028 (XX); ENDC/161) was received with satisfaction in most countries. The United Nations has plainly and unequivocally expressed its view that the barrier in the way of the proliferation of nuclear weapons should not leave any loop-holes, any gaps, through which nuclear weapons might come into the hands of the West German militarists and revanchists, whether in the form of multilateral nuclear forces, Atlantic nuclear forces, or in any other form. It is obvious that this resolution of the Assembly is a suitable basis for rapidly achieving agreement on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Upon the initiative of the African States at the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly, there was adopted a useful resolution (A/RES/2033 (XX); ENDC/162) containing a call upon all States "to respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-free zone". The Soviet Union fully supports this resolution and considers it a clear manifestation of the ever-increasing yearning among the peace-loving States to put an end to the expansion of the sphere of location and the sphere of action of nuclear weapons. The endeavour to create denuclearized zones reflects the demand of the peoples for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and is a step towards nuclear disarmament.

In the opinion of the Soviet Union, the need to create denuclearized zones is particularly acute and urgent in those areas of the world where significant quantities of nuclear weapons are concentrated and there is a great danger of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Government supports the proposal of the People's Republic of Poland (ENDC/C.1/1) to create a denuclearized zone in Central Europe; the implementation of this proposal would be a substantial step towards solving the problem of strengthening European security and, consequently, the security of the whole world as well.

At the twentieth session of the General Assembly, when the question of the final elimination of colonialism was under consideration, an important resolution was adopted embodying the desire of the Members of the United Nations to eliminate foreign military bases in colonial territories. That resolution, as apparently all

(The Chairman, USSR)

the members of our Committee realize quite well, if of particular importance for our negotiations, since the time has come to take specific practical steps directed towards eliminating foreign military bases, those strong points of imperialism and colonialism.

One cannot fail to note, especially today, that nothing but the profound desire of the majority of States for disarmament dictated the resolution of the Assembly (A/RES/2030 (XX); ENDC/162) on the convening, not later than 1967, of a world conference on disarmament to which all States would be invited. The purport of that resolution is to bring the problem of disarmament before a world-wide forum which could give a new and vitalizing impetus to the fruitless negotiations on this question which have been going on for many years.

Today we have spoken many bitter but frank words about the policy of the United States. We have done so in order to show what is preventing the reaching of agreement on disarmament and how to clear the way to agreement.

The Soviet delegation deems it necessary to re-emphasize that the search for ways of reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament should continue to be one of the main tasks of the Committee, since such agreement is the only reliable means of ridding mankind of the threat of a nuclear missile war. To achieve this noble aim the Soviet delegation will not spare any effort, however complex or great the difficulties in its path. Nevertheless, we are bound to express our regret and concern at the tendency which has appeared of late to side-track discussion of this most important problem of today. In this connexion, we should like to emphasize that the Soviet delegation will decisively oppose any such attempt, any such tendency.

The Soviet delegation will take a most active part in the consideration of measures aimed at slowing down the arms race. In the Soviet delegation's opinion, the most urgent questions include, inter alia, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the elimination of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other countries, the renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons, the creation of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world, the cessation of underground nuclear tests, and a number of others.

(The Chairman, USSR)

As is evident from the whole course of development of international life -- and this was borne out by the last session of the United Nations General Assembly -- the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is now in the forefront. In striving for the conclusion of an effective agreement, the Soviet Government submitted its draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons (ENDC/164) to the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly. If we could reach agreement without delay on the basis of the draft treaty proposed by the Soviet Union, all ways for the further spread of nuclear weapons would thereby be closed, and this would be an important contribution to the peace and security of the nations.

The Soviet delegation is of the opinion that the Committee should during its present session consider in the most detailed manner the problem of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and should apply itself to working out a definite agreement on this question. With that as a starting-point, we propose that the Committee should examine and agree, article by article, a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which would close all paths to the proliferation of nuclear weapons directly or indirectly, in any form. The Soviet delegation is fully prepared for this work.

Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): First, Mr. Chairman, I should like to join in your eulogy of Prime Minister Shastri. With the death of that great man the cause of peace has lost a champion. It can truly be said that he gave his life in an effort to bring lasting peace between Pakistan and his own country. We recall that the late Prime Minister of India, in a speech a year ago inaugurating International Co-operation Year, voiced his conviction that only by practical acts of co-operation could peace be strengthened and the future of mankind assured. As we all know, and as has been stated here, his death occurred just as he was carrying out that conviction in the Tashkent Declaration. I am sure we all share the same conviction, and that practical acts of co-operation are the goal of this Committee.

The tribute paid by my Soviet colleague to Prime Minister Sir Abubaker Tafawa Balewa should also be seconded. Here was another great leader, a man who had led his country through the challenging and difficult period following independence. His concern for his fellow men and his interest in the maintenance of peace throughout the world are reflected in his staunch support of the cause of disarmament, "On which", he said, "hangs the peace of the world and the happiness of mankind".

(Mr. Foster, United States)

As you, Mr. Chairman, have stated, India has lost another of its able leaders by the tragic death of Mr. Homi Bhabha, whose work on the peaceful uses of atomic energy is well known throughout the world. He was, indeed, President of the first International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.

I welcome Mr. Spinelli, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General at the Office of the United Nations at Geneva, and Mr. Epstein, our United Nations expert on disarmament, who has been with us so frequently in the past.

It is also good to see Mr. Blusztajn here again as the representative of Poland, and I am very happy to welcome a new representative to our Conference, Mr. Khallaf of the United Arab Republic. There are also many of our old friends around this table, and I am not neglecting them in this welcome to the new session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee.

We in this Committee have a unique opportunity, as well as a heavy responsibility, to seek agreements which will reduce international tension and build the foundation for a stable peace. Existing tensions do not make our task easier. My country is, however, dedicated to the cause we all have in common -- to prohibit nuclear spread, to halt the nuclear arms race, to reduce nuclear stocks, and to prevent nuclear holocaust. We are convinced that progress can be made toward these ends here in Geneva, despite the conflicts occurring elsewhere.

The resolutions recently adopted by the General Assembly (ENDC/161, 162) confirm us in this conviction. Each of the five disarmament resolutions was, as Mr. Spinelli has said, adopted by an overwhelming vote. Those on a world disarmament conference (A/RES/2030 (XX)) and on African denuclearization (A/RES/2033 (XX)) were not addressed directly to this Committee. The remaining three disarmament resolutions, however, were. In one (A/RES/2028 (XX)) we are urged to seek a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons; in another (A/RES/2032 (XX)) to seek extension of the limited test-ban treaty (ENDC/100/Rev.1) to cover underground tests; and in the third (A/RES/2031 (XX)) to continue our efforts toward general and complete disarmament.

My delegation considers those three resolutions to be useful guides for our work here. Treaties prohibiting all nuclear weapon proliferation and all nuclear weapon tests would be significant steps towards our ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. They are possible now; and so are other collateral measures which move toward the ultimate goal. Let us focus on those measures as the best way to achieve progress.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

In that spirit I bring to the Committee the following message from President Johnson:

"The avoidance of war and particularly nuclear war is the central, common concern of all mankind.

"My country is dedicated to this end. The effort to control, and reduce -- and ultimately eliminate -- modern engines of nuclear destruction is fundamental to our policy. We have, with all mankind, a common interest in acting now to prevent nuclear spread, to halt the nuclear arms race, and to reduce nuclear stocks.

"For this reason, we must press on with our work in Geneva. It is true that our meeting is shadowed by continuing aggression against the people and Government of South Viet-Nam. There are differences among the members of this Conference on Viet-Nam, but these differences make our common interest in preventing nuclear spread and curbing the nuclear arms race all the more important to pursue. Even while our own nation is engaged in necessary resistance to aggression in South-East Asia, it must continue to pursue every avenue for stable peace, both in Viet-Nam and throughout the world. That great general effort has no more important set of goals than those of disarmament, which are the business of this Conference.

"I have instructed the United States delegation to urge upon your meeting the following seven-point program:

"First, let us seek a non-proliferation treaty which, in the words of the United Nations General Assembly is 'void of any loop-holes which might permit nuclear or non-nuclear Powers to proliferate, directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons in any form.' We are prepared to sign such a treaty, making it applicable to nuclear and non-nuclear countries alike. We are prepared to work with other countries to assure that no non-nuclear country acquires its own nuclear weapons, gains national control over nuclear weapons, achieves the power itself to fire nuclear weapons, or receives assistance in manufacturing or testing nuclear weapons. We are prepared to agree that these things should not be done directly or indirectly, through third countries or groups of countries, or through units of the armed forces or military personnel under any military alliance.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

"Second, through a non-proliferation treaty and through efforts outside such a treaty, we must continue to secure application of International Atomic Energy Agency or equivalent international safeguards over peaceful nuclear activities. To this end, I urge agreement that all transfers of nuclear materials or equipment for peaceful purposes to countries which do not have nuclear weapons be under IAEA or equivalent international safeguards. At the same time, the major nuclear Powers should accept in increasing measure the same international safeguards they recommend for other States.

"Recently, many responsible members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States introduced resolutions dealing with measures to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. These resolutions are an indication of the importance that the people of the United States attribute to such measures, and to the role that international safeguards should play in them. I fully share these views.

"Third, so that those who forswear nuclear weapons may forever refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race, let us strive to strengthen United Nations and other international security arrangements. Meanwhile, the nations that do not seek the nuclear path can be sure that they will have our strong support against threats of nuclear blackmail.

"Fourth, my country persists in its belief that the perils of proliferation would be materially reduced by an extension of the limited test ban treaty to cover underground nuclear tests. For such an extension, the United States will require only that number and kind of inspections which modern science shows to be necessary to assure that the treaty is being faithfully observed. We call upon those nations truly interested in such a ban to provide to this Committee any improvements in means for the detection and identification of seismic events which their research efforts may have developed.

"Fifth, let us seek agreement not to increase, and indeed to reduce, nuclear materials in weapons stockpiles. The United States continues to urge a verified halt in the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons. We continue to urge that such a halt be accompanied by the transfer of large quantities of fissionable material to peaceful purposes,

(Mr. Foster, United States)

under international safeguards. We continue to urge the demonstrated destruction of thousands of nuclear weapons by the United States and the Soviet Union to produce this fissionable material. We have also stated our willingness, if others cannot now agree to halting all production of fissionable material for use in weapons, to accept step-by-step reductions of such production by the shutting down of equivalent facilities on a plant-by-plant basis, with the same type of effective inspection applicable to all.

"Sixth, as another step to reduce the dangers and burdens of nuclear arms, let us direct our attention to modern, long-range, high-speed carriers of nuclear destruction. I urge continued exploration of the terms and conditions which could make acceptable to all the proposal I put before you in 1964 for a freeze of offensive and defensive strategic bombers and missiles designed to carry nuclear weapons (ENDC/120). If progress can be made here, the United States will be prepared to explore the possibility of significant reductions in the number of these delivery vehicles. To facilitate agreement, let us begin now to seek common understanding of some of the issues involved in both these proposals.

"Seventh, as we focus on nuclear arms, let us not forget that resources are being devoted to non-nuclear arms races all around the world. These resources might better be spent on feeding the hungry, healing the sick and teaching the uneducated. The cost of acquiring and maintaining one squadron of supersonic aircraft diverts resources that would build and maintain a university. We suggest therefore that countries, on a regional basis, explore ways to limit competition among themselves for costly weapons often sought for reasons of illusory prestige. The initiative for arrangements of this kind should, of course, come from the regions concerned. The interested countries should undertake not to acquire from any source, including production of their own as well as importation from others, military equipment which they proscribe. If such arrangements can be worked out and assurance can be given that they will be observed, the United States stands ready to respect them.

"Each of these steps would contribute toward reducing the danger and destruction of war. Each of them would take us further down the path toward our ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. Yet each of them is possible of achievement today if only all nations have the will.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

"The limited test ban treaty lit a candle of hope in the darkness. The gleam of that candle shows the way to a brighter tomorrow if we will but follow. We must move toward it quickly while there is yet time."

I would like that message to be circulated as a Conference document.^{1/}

I had intended to conclude my remarks by that reading of President Johnson's message; but the Soviet representative's wholly unwarranted attack upon my Government's actions in Viet-Nam demands a reply.

I must say that I find it impossible to recognize the world as he sees it. We are in Viet-Nam to resist communist aggression, not because we want to be there. We are helping in Viet-Nam for the same reason that we helped in Greece and Korea: to support a free people which is resisting aggression from outside. Tens of thousands of armed, trained men and tons of armaments have been sent into South Viet-Nam by Hanoi to impose Hanoi's will by force. This aggression is the cause of the increase in American forces, in American military budgets and in American lives lost. These facts are public and are well known to the world. We seek no territory there, no military bases, no military alliance, no economic gains and no extension of the war. We are prepared to leave when a stable peace is achieved. If we left before that time, the aggression from the North might well be rewarded by military conquest.

More than anyone else, those of us who would plan a better tomorrow should remember the lessons of yesterday. The League of Nations failed to prevent the Second World War because the world did not have the will to resist aggression in Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland and Czechoslovakia. The lesson of the thirties is that aggression must be met before it gathers momentum, or it will have to be checked later at much greater cost. The grand structure of peace built after the First World War included arms limits, declarations against war, territorial agreements and peace-keeping machinery; but it all came to nought because aggression was not stopped until it was too late to prevent another world war.

The United States is resisting aggression in Viet-Nam so that that will not happen again. Many others, including many of the members of this Committee, are contributing to South Viet-Nam in their own manner; and most of the countries here have participated in one way or another in attempts to bring about peace in that troubled land. But Hanoi's choice of the battlefield rather than thenegotiating table remains the principal obstacle to peace.

^{1/} Circulated as document ENDC/165

(Mr. Foster, United States)

My Government has done -- and will do -- everything possible to achieve a peaceful settlement in Viet-Nam; but there can be no peace in the world if aggression is rewarded by territorial conquest. That only whets the aggressor's appetite for more. I can, however, agree with one of the Soviet representative's statements: that the people of South Viet-Nam wish to conduct their own affairs in peace. That is why we are there, to help them protect that right.

I have to comment on some of the other remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union. I regret that he felt called upon to deliver another of the distastefully familiar Soviet diatribes against the Federal Republic of Germany. In the United Nations Disarmament Commission on 14 June 1965, Mr. Tsarapkin stated that it was inappropriate for that body -

"... to enter, directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly, into a consideration of the position of, and, a fortiori, to condemn, a State that is not represented in the United Nations ...".

(DC/PV.99, provisional, p.36)

Mr. Tsarapkin seemed anxious to protect the Chinese communists from any criticism, even if only implied. Yet he still seems to feel free to continue his attacks on the Federal Republic of Germany. In this case the fact that the accused party is not represented in the United Nations or in this Committee, and cannot itself reply to these attacks, does not seem to bother the Soviet representative in the least.

One of the basic objectives of my country's foreign policy since the Second World War has been to work for reconciliation and co-operation in Europe and to strengthen the community of peaceful nations. My country is proud, if I may say so, of the results of that policy. The Federal Republic of Germany has a freely-elected democratic Government: and it seeks to have this right of free self-determination available to all Germans. From the ruins of the Second World War, and in spite of the imposed division of Germany, the Federal Republic has emerged as a source of economic strength in Europe and a provider of economic assistance throughout the world. It is dedicated to European co-operation and unity; it has publicly renounced the use of force to achieve its national objectives; and it has entered into a commitment to its allies not to manufacture nuclear, bacteriological or chemical weapons, and to this extent has already made an important contribution towards the objective of non-proliferation. It has forsworn a nationalistic military policy by integrating all its military forces into NATO and by placing them under NATO commands.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

I shall not take the Committee's time again to reply at length to the Soviet representative's unfounded charges that any arrangement for NATO nuclear defence would lead to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the Federal Republic, or any other country. Already today I have quoted the President of the United States on the firm resolve of our nation. We have made our position on this point crystal clear: no such arrangement would result in the transfer of nuclear weapons to the national control of a non-nuclear participant; nor would any such arrangement increase the total number of States and organizations having independent power to use such nuclear weapons; and there would be no increase, even by one, in the centres of nuclear power.

Frankly, I do not know what other assurances the Soviet representative can possibly require. The draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons (ENDC/152) that my delegation has submitted for consideration here should allay any Soviet fears if they are genuine. If, in spite of that, the Soviet Union continues to refuse to discuss a non-proliferation agreement unless all plans for such arrangements are dropped, we can only conclude that its objective is not the conclusion of an effective non-proliferation treaty, but merely to use the issue for its own political ends.

I have noted a number of other points made in the remarks of the representative of the Soviet Union which I should like time to study; and I reserve the right to reply to them at a later meeting.

Mr. OBI (Nigeria): Permit me, Mr. Chairman, before making my prepared statement, to extend to you and to our other colleagues our heartiest welcome. My delegation is indeed pleased to see so many familiar faces once more and to welcome those who, like the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Khallaf, and our old friend Mr. Blusztajn of Poland, are either joining us for the first time or returning to our midst after a long absence.

I observe from the recommendations of the co-Chairmen which you read, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of the plenary meeting this afternoon and which were adopted by the Committee, that prominence is given to the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is as it should be, for this is, as the Chairman stressed, the greatest danger confronting humanity now. It also happens to be the main theme of my statement this afternoon.

(Mr. Cbi, Nigeria)

My delegation also listened with great interest to President Johnson's message and the seven-point programme just read to us by the representative of the United States, Mr. Foster. We look forward to seeing it in the verbatim record and to giving it careful study.

We also listened, Mr. Chairman, with great interest to your statement, to which we shall give our full attention.

The Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee is resuming its work once again after a recess during which the United Nations General Assembly gave careful consideration to the matters with which this Committee is charged. The discussions of the General Assembly last session were probably more significant and far reaching than at any other session. Three important resolutions were adopted virtually unanimously -- at any rate without any significant negative vote and with majorities of over 100.

Perhaps the most important of these resolutions was that relating to convening a world disarmament conference (A/RES/2030(XK); ENDC/162). As this is not a subject with which our Committee is directly charged, I shall refrain from speaking on it. I shall, however, express the satisfaction of my delegation that all members of this Committee voted in favour of this resolution, thus making the task of those who will undertake the necessary consultations relatively lighter. The adoption of this resolution is, however, only a beginning, albeit a very important beginning. Much work, as we all know, still remains to be done to convene such a conference not later than 1967.

A series of penetrating questions were asked by certain delegations during the consideration of this item in the First Committee, questions to which answers must be found. I am confident, however, that given the continued goodwill which manifested itself during the debates on the question, especially towards the end, arrangements satisfactory to all concerned, including the great and most militarily significant Powers, will be worked out.

Another very important resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly during its twentieth session is that dealing with the denuclearization of Africa (A/RES/2033(XK); ibid.). Like the resolution on the convening of a world disarmament conference, it requires no action of this Committee. The African States recognize -- and this was clearly reflected in the resolution -- that the responsibility for translating their wishes into reality is essentially theirs. Much of the work, therefore, will have to be done within the framework of our regional organization --

(Mr. Cbi, Nigeria)

the Organization of African Unity -- and with the co-operation of the nuclear Powers. In this connexion the Nigerian delegation was pleased that all the principal nuclear Powers voted for the resolution.

It is true, of course, that one of these nuclear Powers, whose full co-operation we consider necessary if we are to denuclearize the continent of Africa, made certain reservations -- reservations of principle -- in connexion with operative paragraph 4. I must say in all sincerity that, while we greatly appreciate the fact that this great nuclear Power voted for the resolution, its reservations notwithstanding, we trust that it will be able to consider the question of the denuclearization of Africa strictly on its own merits. We are confident that if this is done its reluctance to commit itself on the lines of operative paragraph 4 of the resolution will be considerably diminished, if not eliminated. We eagerly look forward to such an evolution of policy as we are only too well aware of the unfavourable impact which an unchanged policy would have, not only on the denuclearization of Africa but also on the future actions of the smaller non-nuclear and non-aligned States of Africa and elsewhere.

The third important -- and in certain respects most significant -- resolution adopted at the last session of the General Assembly is A/RES/2028(XX) relating to non-proliferation of nuclear weapons (ENDC/161). This resolution states inter alia:

that the General Assembly --

"1. Urges all States to take all steps necessary for the early conclusion of a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons;

2. Calls upon the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to give urgent consideration to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and, to that end, to reconvene as early as possible with a view to negotiating an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, based on the following main principles:

(a) The treaty should be void of any loop-holes which might permit nuclear or non-nuclear Powers to proliferate, directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons in any form;

(b) The treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers;

(c) The treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and, more particularly, nuclear disarmament;

(Mr. Obi, Nigeria)

(d) There should be acceptable and workable provisions to ensure the effectiveness of the treaty;

(e) Nothing in the treaty should adversely affect the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties in order to ensure the total absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories."

This resolution contains provisions and principles almost as important as those of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles (ENDC/5). Its adoption by the General Assembly shows, in our view, that at last the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is being approached in a realistic fashion. Hitherto the subject has been discussed in rather sweeping and general terms and the impression created that an agreement on non-proliferation would be a sort of panacea for all international ills. Furthermore, as my delegation pointed out in New York, it seems to us that the present nuclear and super-Powers conceive of this problem in a somewhat myopic fashion. Their approach is somewhat lopsided and their preoccupation seems to us to be with certain countries in Central Europe. We do, of course, recognize that the problems of Central Europe are almost inextricably linked with disarmament problems; and we do understand and sympathize with the aspirations and fears of those more directly concerned. We do recognize that any undue disturbance of the present military balance, either in Central Europe or elsewhere, would have serious repercussions on the peace and stability of the whole world.

When all this has been said, however, we submit that it would be wrong to approach the problem of non-proliferation from the sole angle of preoccupation with the maintenance or otherwise of the status quo in Central Europe, as has been the case so far and still appears to be the case from what we heard this afternoon. A universal approach to the problem is not only essential but desirable and inescapable. After all, the treaty on non-proliferation, should we achieve one, would impose heavier obligations on the non-nuclear Powers than on the nuclear Powers. It is, I believe, safe to assume that no nuclear Power alert to the dangers of further proliferation would now willingly give nuclear weapons or the necessary technology and facilities for their manufacture to non-nuclear Powers. That is primarily a question of national self-interest. The national interest of certain non-nuclear Powers might well dictate different requirements. Non-nuclear Powers might feel obliged to seek to acquire nuclear weapons so as to obtain the maximum possible security.

(Mr. Obi, Nigeria)

As you are all aware, the Nigerian delegation has always rejected the thesis that the desire of hitherto non-nuclear States to acquire nuclear weapons is only a question of prestige. As we declared in New York on 19 October:

"Much too often the desirability of non-nuclear Powers to acquire nuclear weapons has been glibly explained away as a desire to acquire added prestige, to secure admission to a select club or a seat at the high table of the councils of the great. There may well be such an element in the calculations of certain Powers, but I submit that this is subordinated to other considerations. The fact, and we make no apologies for stating it, is that the smaller and, incidentally, non-nuclear and largely non-aligned Powers have fears, fears which are not only genuine but which have to be taken into account in any realistic approach to the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

"One could argue -- and this is the official position of my Government -- that the acquisition of nuclear weapons per se does not necessarily increase the security of States and that non-nuclear States, especially States such as Nigeria which require all their resources for the development of their economy, would be well advised not to embark on a course so fraught with danger and hardship. Nonetheless, it is not difficult to conceive of a situation in which a country would be under great pressure from its population to acquire nuclear weapons in the belief -- no matter how erroneous --

"that that would make them more secure from external threats or fears of them.

"There is, so far, no guarantee that the massive nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear Powers would not be used against non-nuclear States or that the latter would not be the victims of nuclear blackmail. An indispensable element in any non-proliferation measure is, therefore, a firm undertaking with adequate guarantees by the nuclear Powers not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear Powers under any circumstances whatever, or to threaten to use them. So long as non-nuclear States have the possibility of having nuclear weapons used against them, so long as this fear hangs over them like a sword of Damocles, so long as they are threatened with nuclear weapons or subjected to nuclear blackmail, then so

(Mr. Obi, Nigeria)

long will pressures build up in the countries of non-nuclear Powers to acquire nuclear weapons; pressures which even the most responsible and peace-loving governments would find difficult to resist for very long.

"My delegation feels that even the sort of non-proliferation measure and concerted action which I have just outlined should not be left to stand on its own for too long. Strenuous efforts must be made to realize the following additional objectives:

- (a) a comprehensive test-ban treaty and a cessation of all nuclear weapons tests in all environments and for all time;
- (b) a strengthening of United Nations capacities to maintain peace in the world and to thwart aggression against any country small or great, non-nuclear or nuclear;
- (c) a freeze of all production of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery;
- (d) the initiation of definite action aimed at the destruction of the nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the present nuclear Powers." (A/C.1/PV.1356 (provisional) pp.27-31)

The above thesis, which was developed by the Nigerian delegation in New York, received very wide support from Members of the United Nations, including some members of this Committee. While, therefore, we all agree that it is urgent to conclude an agreement on non-proliferation, we must recognize that it will not be easy to conclude an effective agreement on non-proliferation which would command universal adherence and which would reflect the views expressed by non-nuclear Powers on the question in New York and the balance of responsibilities and obligations referred to in General Assembly resolution A/RES/2028 (XX).

In the circumstances one wonders whether it would not be more profitable for the nuclear Powers to explore more directly and urgently the possibility of concluding a non-dissemination agreement among themselves. In a part of Nigeria some time ago, during the colonial period, we had a wealthy citizen in one of our provincial towns, one of three people who had a telephone in his residence. This man used to telephone the Administrative Officer and say, "Big man talk to Big man". It seems to us that it would be appropriate for "big man to talk to big man" this time -- that is, for the nuclear Powers to hold conversations among themselves so as to agree on a non-dissemination treaty which will oblige them not to give nuclear weapons or information necessary for their manufacture to non-nuclear States.

(Mr. Obi, Nigeria)

Such a non-dissemination agreement could be a useful and significant prelude to a wider and more comprehensive agreement on non-proliferation. A search for such an agreement on non-proliferation should still, of course, be pursued with energy and determination; and to facilitate such an agreement the nuclear Powers could demonstrate their seriousness of purpose by making progress -- that is, reaching agreements -- in certain fields such as a comprehensive test-ban treaty and some collateral measures aimed at freezing production of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery.

Indeed, my delegation hopes that this year our Committee will give serious consideration to a treaty banning all nuclear weapons tests. This has been on our agenda for a very long time and there is frankly no reason why an agreement has not been reached. It is time the undertaking contained in the preamble to the Moscow Treaty is fulfilled. If we really want to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, what better start can we make than by agreeing to ban effectively all nuclear weapons tests in all environments?

Serious consideration should also be given to the various proposals aimed at freezing military expenditures, freezing the numbers and characteristics of strategic delivery vehicles, freezing the production of fissionable materials, and transferring significant quantities to peaceful purposes. In this connexion the recent United States proposal (ENDC/165, p.2) to extract such fissionable materials from existing nuclear warheads is a step in the right direction, and we welcome it warmly.

Our main task still remains the elaboration of a treaty on general and complete disarmament. We are happy that due note of this has been taken in the co-Chairmen's recommendations adopted at the beginning of the meeting this afternoon. During our brief discussions last year the subject was only perfunctorily touched upon. My delegation still feels that we should continue to forge ahead in this field, and as a first step resolve the deadlock over setting up an appropriate working organ to deal with the problems of reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear delivery vehicles.

From the foregoing it is clear that this Committee has a lot on its plate this session, and we have no doubt that it will do its best to make progress on on some of these questions. I need not emphasize that it is not almost four years since this Committee started to work under relatively propitious conditions. Hopes were raised in long-suffering humanity that at last something would be done to

(Mr. Obi, Nigeria)

help reverse the arms race. The Committee -- admittedly due to no fault of some of its members -- has been unable to reach any agreement and to justify the confidence which humanity has placed in it; but we sincerely trust that this will be rectified this year. Needless to say, my delegation will continue to co-operate with other delegations in seeking fair solutions to the various problems of which we are seized.

Mr. KHALLAF (United Arab Republic (translated from French);

On behalf of my delegation, I should like to associate myself with the condolences expressed here to the people and Government of India for the double loss they have suffered in the persons of Mr. Shastri and Mr. Bhabha, each of whom in his particular sphere rendered outstanding services to his country and to the cause of peace. We also offer our condolences to the people and Government of Nigeria for the loss of that great African statesman, Prime Minister Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa.

I should next like to thank our Chairman and the representatives who spoke before me for their kind references to myself. I want you to know how honoured I feel to represent my country in this Committee, and I shall closely adhere to the line previously followed by representatives of the United Arab Republic in this Committee, an attitude which may be explained by our desire to co-operate with all the delegations represented here and by our determination to serve constantly the cause of security and a just peace through disarmament.

My delegation is glad that our Conference is resuming its work on the problem of disarmament, the importance and urgency of which are reaffirmed from one day to the next and which the gravity of the present international situation can only accentuate.

We are meeting this year at Geneva at a time when a certain number of different developments and factors have combined to strengthen the general cause of disarmament and to give it a new impulse. It would not be without interest to try to discuss here together our ideas on the cause of disarmament as it stands now that we are resuming our work at Geneva. My delegation will therefore try to identify the present characteristics of disarmament, so as to deduce from them some useful indications regarding the impetus and general orientation which should be imparted to our work during the meetings our Conference will hold this year.

(Mr. Khallaf, United Arab Republic)

In the first place, the General Assembly, the chief policy-making organ of the United Nations in matters of disarmament, has at last been able to resume its normal activities, and consequently the vigilance which it exercised each year with regard to this problem has now been restored. The Assembly has thus survived a paralysis which might have condemned it, and with it the United Nations, to a slow death which would have been equally disastrous for large and for small countries.

The convening of the twentieth regular session of the Assembly is an obvious triumph of the will of all the nations, and especially of the developing nations, to safeguard the United Nations and to spare the world the disastrous consequences of the failure of the League of Nations. Despite the shortcomings of the United Nations and the difficulties that it encounters in meeting the new demands of our modern world, there is increasing realization of the unique opportunity that this Organization offers for establishing a positive dialogue aimed at securing the triumph of co-operation over domination, and of reason and justice over the madness of armaments.

That is why the delegation of the United Arab Republic welcomes the unanimous support which the United Nations received on the occasion of its twentieth anniversary, and the manifestations of a general determination to make it an even more effective instrument for promoting the cause of disarmament and ensuring a just peace in the world. The convening of the twentieth session of the Assembly thus enabled the United Nations to attack once again the difficult and complex problem of disarmament, which was rightly given high priority in the debates of that session, engaged the attention of nearly all the delegations, and was the subject of extensive discussions.

Moreover, the resolutions adopted by the Assembly this year (ENDC/161,162) are characterized by certain positive and realistic elements, in both their procedure and their substance. The final outcome of the debates, and of the measures on the subject adopted by the Assembly during the last session, was to breathe new life into the cause of disarmament, a fact which we shall demonstrate when we have the opportunity of commenting on the resolutions adopted by the Assembly.

(Mr. Khallaf, United Arab Republic)

In addition ~~it~~ should be pointed out that a general tendency can now be discerned towards a more objective appraisal of the value and necessity of disarmament to the general interests of mankind, as opposed to the notion, which prevailed until recently, of regarding disarmament and wishing to attain it simply as an instrument with which to serve the interests of particular Powers.

This more objective appraisal of disarmament is largely due to the accentuation of a contemporary political phenomenon, the emancipation of the peoples of Africa and Asia. No sooner had these peoples thrown off the colonial yoke and taken their legitimate place in the community of nations, than they immediately opted for the achievement of a stable peace. The peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America are imbued with a sincere desire for peace, since they are fully aware of the part which a just peace can play in securing their development. Hence from the outset they have shown themselves firmly resolved and determined to collaborate with the rest of the world in eliminating the scourge of war and achieving general and complete disarmament.

It was therefore perfectly normal for these peoples to cast their full weight on the side of disarmament. They were not content to demand vigorously that disarmament should become a reality; they also took an active part in the discussions on the subject, even making certain specific proposals, as is proved by the plans for the denuclearization of Latin America (ENDC/87, 117) and Africa (A/RES/2033 (XX); ENDC/162) and by the ideas contained in the resolutions adopted by the African Summit Conference and the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries (A/5763), both held at Cairo in 1964. By their words and deeds these developing nations have helped to give to the notion of disarmament its true character of a general and common interest, not an exclusive concern of the Great Powers.

Thus, for instance, through the initiative of the non-aligned countries and as a result of their assiduous efforts, the General Assembly was able to adopt its resolution 2030 (XX) of 29 November 1965 (ENDC/162) on the convening of a world conference on disarmament to which all countries would be invited. With this resolution the United Nations filled the last gap in the principle of the universality of disarmament. That is why we wholeheartedly supported it;

(Mr. Khallaf, United Arab Republic)

we hope that all countries will participate in the conference and that no effort will be spared, either within or outside the United Nations, to create favourable conditions for the convening of the conference and its success.

As another manifestation of this trend towards a more objective appraisal of the value and universal necessity of disarmament, my delegation would like to cite a favourable development which made an appearance, admittedly timid, during the session of the Disarmament Commission in New York in April 1965 but was subsequently strengthened at the last session of our Conference in July and recently at the General Assembly in New York. This trend concerns the interdependence between the debates on disarmament and the international situation as a whole, a relation which is now regarded in a new and healthier manner. At one time an improvement in the international situation was considered to be a condition sine qua non for disarmament negotiations, an attitude which unnecessarily blocked all discussion of disarmament while stocks and improvements of nuclear weapons advanced inexorably. Moreover, the deterioration of the international situation was an easy excuse either to suspend debates already in progress or to defer until later the conclusion of an agreement which could otherwise have been concluded at once. This in no way helped to improve an international situation which was already dangerously tense.

Now, on the contrary, we observe -- or at least we hope for -- a sounder perception of the relation between discussions on disarmament and the international situation. An improvement in the latter has become, as it should be, a parallel goal which must be pursued in order that progress may be made along the path to disarmament, while at the same time agreements on certain aspects of disarmament are sought to relax international tension and to prevent it from leading to a world conflagration. Thus no means and no opportunity of ensuring world peace will be neglected.

We have all needed much time, effort and patience to reach a stage at which the problem of disarmament could be placed in its proper perspective in relation to the international situation and at which it could escape from the vicious circle in which it was enclosed.

(Mr. Khallaf, United Arab Republic)

A final characteristic of the problem of disarmament as we see it now, one of the most significant, is provided by the important resolutions on disarmament adopted at the twentieth session of the General Assembly, which entrust our Conference with a very special responsibility and at the same time contain positive and specific elements relating to our work at Geneva.

My delegation would like to submit some comments on this to the Conference, in the hope of thus casting some light on the plans for our future work.

Those resolutions relate to two traditional aspects of our activities, general and complete disarmament and collateral measures.

In regard to general and complete disarmament, the Assembly has asked us (A/RES/2031 (XX); ENDC/161) to continue our work of preparing a draft treaty. That in this regard the Assembly has confined itself to confirming our original terms of reference in no way diminishes our responsibility but indeed enhances it, for the following two main reasons.

First, although most of the delegations, headed by the two great nuclear Powers, which spoke on disarmament in the Assembly reiterated their unequivocal support for general and complete disarmament, other delegations took the opportunity to deplore the absence of tangible progress and the relaxation of our efforts for this purpose.

Secondly, although the resolution gave us no new and specific directives to accelerate our work, the Assembly nevertheless specified that it expected substantial progress from us by the end of this year.

Hence the delegation of the United Arab Republic hopes that you share its conviction that the urgent study of specific collateral measures which we were instructed to undertake must not divert us from our major duty to work for general and complete disarmament.

Furthermore, the prospect of a world conference on disarmament should in no way slow down the impetus of our work on the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament. No effort made in our Committee can fail to benefit this conference.

With regard to collateral measures, we are called upon to study two specific measures urgently. The first is the problem of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which rightly held the centre of the stage at the twentieth session of the Assembly. The long debates, the interminable discussions and the exchanges

(Mr. Khallaf, United Arab Republic)

of views which have followed one another for several years on this subject have at length made it possible to circumscribe the problem and to provide for its most appropriate solution, so that it may be said that all elements necessary for such a solution have at last been collected. After the official submission of the United States and Soviet Union drafts (ENDC/152, 164) on the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons, and the adoption by the General Assembly of a resolution (A/RES/2028 (XX); ENDC/161) setting out the principles on which a treaty should be based, it may be said that our Conference is now definitely instructed to prepare a treaty on this subject. We are encouraged by the fact that the two great nuclear Powers have refrained from taking any action which might finally block an agreement on non-dissemination.

The second measure that the Assembly has instructed us (A/RES/2032 (XX); ibid.) to study as a matter of urgency relates to the need for the immediate suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. Delegations to the Assembly expressed their impatience and found it difficult to understand the technical reasons and political considerations which are sometimes invoked to delay the conclusion of an agreement prohibiting nuclear weapon tests at any time and anywhere. My delegation will have occasion to revert to this subject; but at this stage it would like to stress that any delay in solving this problem gives rise to the danger of nullifying the results hitherto achieved in the cause of disarmament.

With regard to collateral measures in general, we still have to consider a certain number of important measures proposed by the United States of America and by the Soviet Union. We have had occasion to express our views on this subject, but unfortunately no agreement has yet been reached on it. We have noted with interest certain adjustments which the United States delegation has proposed (ENDC/165) in some of the collateral measures designed to slow down the race for nuclear weapons, particularly as regards the possibility of a substantial material destruction of nuclear weapons.

We think that perhaps this constitutes an effort by the United States delegation to take into account the Soviet Union's objection that those proposals implied the establishment of control without disarmament. We hope that the United States delegation will develop this new aspect of its proposals and that the

(Mr. Khallaf, United Arab Republic)

Soviet Union will be able to inform us of its reactions to them. We believe that we should continue, with the same patience and perseverance as before, to explore all possibilities of agreement concerning the collateral measures submitted by the United States and the Soviet Union.

In the light of the foregoing analysis, my delegation considers that the main objectives of our future work should be:

First, to pursue vigorously our efforts to complete the preparation of a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

Secondly, to work urgently towards the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and an agreement on the prohibition of nuclear tests in all environments.

Thirdly, to continue to explore all possibilities of agreement on the other collateral measures proposed by the United States and the Soviet Union.

This new impetus which has been given to the cause of disarmament must be accompanied by ever-increasing efforts on the part of us all and by a more intense spirit of conciliation and compromise on the part of the Great Powers.

Side by side with our activities and in order to give them real substance, we must also strive to bring the world back from the edge of the abyss which threatens to engulf it. Genuine and continuous efforts, based on respect of the right of peoples to self-determination, must be made to put an end to all acts of aggression, injustice and interference committed against the small nations which are already struggling desperately to safeguard their independence and freedom and which ardently desire to participate in the advancement of mankind.

Lord CHALFONT (United Kingdom): I should like to begin what will be a very short intervention by expressing to Ambassador Trivedi the deep sadness that I, personally, as well as my Government, felt when we heard of the two heavy blows that had fallen upon his country, one so distressingly soon after the other. Anyone who met Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri must have been moved and inspired by his deep humility and constant search for a way along the roads to peace. The loss of Mr. Homi Bhabha, a great and internationally-respected scientist, will be felt for many years well beyond the frontiers of India.

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

May I also express to Mr. Obi, the representative of Nigeria, my distress at the events which led to the death of another remarkable international statesman, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa?

The tasks which confront us at this session are certainly no less urgent -- and possibly more urgent -- than they have been in the past. Because this Committee is still the principal negotiating body for disarmament, it has a very great responsibility. This is a fact to which the recent debates in the First Committee and the General Assembly of the United Nations bear witness. If we fail to make progress here, I hope it will not be for any want of effort on the part of any of us. Certainly my own Government attaches the first importance to achieving progress in arms control and disarmament. Before I left London to come to Geneva, I discussed with my Prime Minister what I hoped we might achieve at this session of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee; he expressed great concern for our success and asked me to deliver to the Committee a personal message from him^{1/}, which reads:

"The Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee is resuming its activities at a time when, more than ever before, the world community stands in need of, and urgently expects, progress towards the great objective of arms control and disarmament. The British Government consequently welcomes the fact that the Committee has agreed to resume its work so soon after the conclusion of the disarmament debate in the United Nations General Assembly.

"By the resolutions adopted at the recent session of the United Nations General Assembly, the nations demonstrated their support for and their trust in the Committee. That they did so must be a matter of deep satisfaction to all delegations; it will also, I hope, be a spur to renewed efforts in the months ahead. The British Government pledges itself to co-operate untiringly in the search for progress.

"In accordance with the wishes expressed by the twentieth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Committee will be giving urgent consideration to the working out of an agreement to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. This is by general

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

agreement the most pressing need in the disarmament field. I trust that the two draft non-proliferation treaties before the Committee will provide a basis for serious negotiation in order to resolve the differences that stand in the way of agreement.

"The Committee will also continue its search for agreement on arrangements to ban nuclear tests in all environments. This would not only be a most valuable achievement in itself, but would also make a vital contribution to our efforts to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons.

"The coming session will, I hope, be marked by fresh efforts to find a basis for a start on real disarmament and also by progress towards a solution of the complex problems involved in an agreement for general and complete disarmament.

"I send the Disarmament Committee my best wishes for a constructive and fruitful session."

On my own behalf, I would only add that the United Kingdom delegation will do everything in its power to help the Committee to reach constructive solutions to the problems that face it.

On behalf of the United Kingdom delegation, I should like to repeat the warm welcome that has already been extended to Mr. Spinelli, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

I should like to say too that today, as on other occasions both here and in New York, I have listened with profit and interest to what the representative of Nigeria, Mr. Obi, has had to say; and I do him no more than justice by recalling all the important and helpful contributions that he has made to our discussions in the past. He is -- if I may borrow his own image -- a "big" man in every meaning of the word.

I am glad too to have this early opportunity of welcoming the representative of the United Arab Republic. The contribution of his country's delegation to our efforts in the field of disarmament has always been of very great value and Ambassador Khallaf's thoughtful speech today is an assurance that this will continue to be so.

Perhaps I might also greet the representative of Poland, since, although he is not a new face to many representatives at this table, I myself have not had the pleasure of working with him previously.

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

I shall not address myself today to any of the substantive questions that lie before us in the coming weeks, although I reserve the right, of course, to comment later on many of the matters that have been brought up today, and especially on the somewhat eccentric comments made by Mr. Tsarapkin on the projects which he evidently believes are being contemplated in the Western Alliance. I have heard of many proposals for strategic development in NATO, but I must confess that to me, at any rate, the "Tsarapkin plan", if I understood it correctly, is an entirely new one.

I am sorry that our first meeting should have begun with a routine attack by the representative of the Soviet Union on the policies of the West, and especially of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. I suppose it was predictable and inevitable, but I can hardly believe that these rather one-sided historical reconstructions of the Viet-Nam crisis, and these rehearsals of familiar attitudes to the crisis, will do very much to advance our deliberations here; nor will constant repetition of unjustifiable attacks upon the Federal Republic of Germany.

I hope, now that the representative of the Soviet Union has carried out his ritual attack on the United States and other Western Allies that we shall be able to get on with the real business of this Committee. Can we not accept that there are real differences and real conflicts of interests here, and see what we can do to minimize their dangers? I should like to express the hope -- without, I must admit, very much confidence that it will be realized -- that we shall not be exposed to a series of these doctrinaire attacks on Western good faith before the Committee has had a chance to put it to the test in some serious negotiations about the issues that we have met here to discuss.

I cannot at this stage resist remarking upon the contrast provided by the contribution of the representative of the United States, and especially by the seven points contained in the encouraging and constructive message of his President (ENDC/165).

Mr. Tsarapkin has thought it necessary to describe in some detail what he believes to be the barriers that lie in the way of agreement on arms control and disarmament. This is a useful exercise if we do not allow ourselves to become obsessed by it. I hope that we shall address ourselves in the coming weeks to the problem of finding ways over -- or at least round -- these barriers and

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

concentrate less upon those matters on which we differ and more on the possibilities of finding some common ground. We may then be able to negotiate agreements which may in themselves be small steps but which may still be important steps to a wider and more far-reaching accord.

Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland): I should like to thank all my colleagues who have welcomed me back to this Committee, and to say that I am very glad to be here and will do my best to contribute to the success of its work.

Do I understand that during our next meeting, on Tuesday, we shall be continuing what we might call the "general debate"?

The CHAIRMAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): When I put before the Committee the co-Chairmen's recommendations concerning the procedure of work of the Committee, there was a proposal (I can read out the relevant passage) that, unless the Committee had any other views, a general debate should take place for a while, as has been the case in the past. This recommendation of the co-Chairmen was not subjected here to any change, and so this procedure was adopted. Therefore it is understood that, in so far as there are speakers to take part in the general debate, the next meeting will be devoted also to the general debate.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 235th meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H. E. Ambassador S. K. Tsarapkin, representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"Statements were made in tribute to the memories of Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister of India, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of Nigeria, and Mr. Homi J. Bhabha, Chairman of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission, by the Chairman on behalf of the members of the Committee and by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on behalf of the Secretary-General. The Committee observed a minute of silence as a mark of respect for the deceased. The representatives of India and of Nigeria thanked the Committee and the Secretary-General.

"The Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations made a statement and conveyed a message to the Conference from the Secretary-General.

"After the conclusion of the open part of the meeting, statements were made by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States, Nigeria, the United Arab Republic and the United Kingdom.

"The following documents were tabled:

Letter dated 14 January 1966 from the Secretary-General to the co-Chairmen transmitting resolutions 2028 (XX), 2031 (XX) and 2032 (XX) of the General Assembly (ENDC/161).

Letter dated 14 January from the Secretary-General to the co-Chairmen transmitting resolutions 2030 (XX) and 2033 (XX) of the General Assembly (ENDC/162).

Letter dated 26 January from the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the co-Chairmen transmitting the text of a letter addressed to the Secretary-General by His Holiness Pope Paul VI (ENDC/163).

Letter dated 24 September 1965 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR addressed to the President of the General Assembly (A/5976) (ENDC/164).

Message dated 27 January 1966 from President Johnson to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC/165).

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 1 February 1966, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

